DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 227 325 CE 035 404

AUTHOR Pritchard, May Long
TITLE State Youth Employment and Training Initiatives--Seven Models. Working Paper #2. The State Youth Initiatives Project.
INSTITUTION Public/Private Ventures, Philadelphia, PA.
SPONS AGENCY Mott (C.S.) Foundation, Flint, Mich.
PUB DATE Dec 82
NOTE 29p.; For related documents, see CE 035 405-406.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adolescents; *Disadvantaged Youth; Economically Disadvantaged; Educationally Disadvantaged; *Employment Programs; *Job Training; *Models; Policy Formation; Program Costs; Program Descriptions; Program Development; Program Effectiveness; Program Implementation; State Action; *State Programs; Statewide Planning; Young Adults; *Youth Employment; *Youth Programs
IDENTIFIERS California; Colorado; Connecticut; Indiana; Michigan; Oregon; Wisconsin

ABSTRACT

This paper is one in a series of research papers related to the state role in youth employment and training. It describes seven state-sponsored youth employment and training programs, representing a varied range of approaches that states have undertaken to address their youth employment problems. The first section of this paper provides capsule descriptions of youth initiatives in the states of California, Colorado, Connecticut, Indiana, Michigan, Oregon, and Wisconsin. The youth initiatives in these states are at various stages of growth or development, ranging from the policy formulation stage to implementation. The second section of the paper highlights both the common characteristics and distinctive features of these efforts in seven areas: origins, goals, implementation, target youth, funding, private sector involvement, and results. This is followed by a conclusion that pinpoints some of the requisites of an effective comprehensive state youth employment and training effort. (KC)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED227325

Public/Private Ventures
1701 Arch Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103
(215) 564-4815

# The State Youth Initiatives Project

## Working Paper #2

## State Youth Employment and Training Initiatives—Seven Models

by May Long Pritchard

December 1982

CE 035 404

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M L Pritchard

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

This publication was made possible by a grant from the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS


| | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| INTRODUCTION | | 1 |
| I. | CAPSULE DESCRIPTIONS | 2 |
| | A. California | 2 |
| | B. Colorado | 4 |
| | C. Connecticut | 6 |
| | D. Indiana | 8 |
| | E. Michigan | 10 |
| | F. Oregon | 12 |
| | G. Wisconsin | 14 |
| II. | HIGHLIGHTS | 16 |
| | A. Origins | 16 |
| | B. Goals | 17 |
| | C. Implementation | 17 |
| | D. Target Youth | 17 |
| | E. Funding | 18 |
| | F. Private Sector Involvement | 19 |
| | G. Results | 20 |
| III. | CONCLUSION | 24 |

## INTRODUCTION

Over the past year, P/PV has been studying a variety of state-sponsored youth employment and training programs. This paper describes seven of these efforts, representing what we believe is a varied and useful range of approaches that states have undertaken to address their youth employment problems.

The first section of this paper provides capsule descriptions of youth initiatives in the states of California, Colorado, Connecticut, Indiana, Michigan, Oregon and Wisconsin.

The youth initiatives in these states are at various stages of growth or development. In California, Colorado, Connecticut and Wisconsin, policy development has been completed and program implementation is well underway.

Although Indiana's Youth Commission is expiring at the end of January, 1983, it appears that the five local projects, which the Commission seeded, plan to continue.

Oregon's $YE^2P$ (Youth Employment and Education Program), begun in 1981, has been stalled due in large part to the state's severe economic and adult unemployment problems that have assumed priority for state policymakers.

Michigan has recently completed policy formulation, with strong gubernatorial (Milliken) support. Implementation, primarily the joint responsibility of the state's Departments of Employment and Education is being negotiated. The state's Youth Clearinghouse is the broker in the process.

The second section highlights both the common characteristics and distinctive features of these efforts in seven areas: origins, goals, implementation, target youth, funding, private sector involvement and results. This is followed by a conclusion that pinpoints some of the requisites of an effective comprehensive state youth employment and training effort.

# I. CAPSULE DESCRIPTIONS

## A. California: Youth Employment Program

This is a state-wide employer-based strategy, legislated in 1977 under the state's Youth Employment and Development Act (YEDA) to complement and supplement federally-funded youth employment and training programs. In September 1982, the legislature reauthorized YEDA through 1987. A primary reason for the program's creation was to provide a "flexible" funding source to test innovative programming, involving the private sector, which is not allowed under more restrictive federal regulations. These program types include: private sector work experience, job trials, and variable rate On-the-Job Training (OJT).

The state's Employment Development Department has been closely monitoring YEDA and has produced several progress reports. The California experience with the private sector and youth is unique and provides some useful lessons.

### Key Elements

- Serves youth 16-21 who are unemployed, with focus on those who: 1) have difficulty obtaining employment: 2) reside in the inner-city; 3) are members of families whose annual income does not exceed 95% of the lower standard of living. The 1982 reauthorization targets youth receiving public assistance.

- Components include: private sector employment, incentives to youth to stay in school, direct involvement of private sector in program design, youth service plan, local service coordination.

- Program types:

  - private sector work experience

  - "job trials", a variation of private sector work experience via: 1-4 weeks job exposure, or 1-4 weeks "try-out" for both youth and employer, prior to hiring commitment

  - variable rate OJT

  - apprenticeship

  - community service (public sector work experience)

## Distinctive Features

- Administered by a combined CETA office that oversees both YEDA (state) and YETP (federal) funding.
- Availability of state funds has allowed the state CETA office to test program models not allowable under less flexible federal regulations, e.g., private sector work experience.
- YEDA expenditures FY 1979-1982: $14 million, serving 11,000 youth, cost per youth, $2,910.

## Publications

- Youth Employment in California (1979-80), State of California Employment Development Department.
- Youth Enterprises Feasibility Study, E.H. White & Co.
- Employment Problems and Programs for Inner City Youth, California Employment and Training Advisory Council and California ACVE.

## Contact

Douglas X. Patino
Director
State CETA Office
Employment Development Department
800 Capitol Mall
Sacramento, CA 95814
916-445-4546

B. Colorado: Youth Coordination Strategy

The impetus for this effort was the Governor's CETA Youth Council. The aim of the Strategy is to provide high-risk youth with a dozen school-to-work transition services, including assessment, occupational information, work experience, and basic skills, drawing on the resources of a variety of youth service agencies.

The Strategy was developed through the collaboration of five state agencies. A formal agreement of commitment has been signed by each of parties. The state's Alliance of Business has played an active role in generating awareness and support of the Coordination Strategy throughout the state's business community.

Key Elements

- Serves multi-problem, high risk youth.
- Identifies 12 youth service needs: assessment, occupational information, understanding the labor market, placement, co-op/OJT, work experience, basic skills support for placement, basic skills support for training, occupational training preparation, special counseling, jobs access, relocation.
- Implementation is reponsibility of five-agency Youth Policy Group: Departments of Education, Institutions, Labor & Employment, Social Services, and Occupational Education.
- Effective at three levels:
  - Jefferson County Demonstration Project, where all relevant state agencies and their local offices have organized a comprehensive youth transition system;
  - State-wide, where state agencies provide assistance in areas of academic credit, private sector cooperation, occupational information and job placement, to locations throughout the state;
  - Local, where experimental projects, following the aims of the Youth Strategy are carried out by local actors.

## Distinctive Features

- The Governor's CETA Youth Council is responsible for identifying needs, developing ideas and coordination strategies, and monitoring the progress of the Strategy.
- Formal agreement of cooperation, recognizing mutual responsibility, signed by five state agencies.
- Active role played by the State's Alliance of Business in support of Strategy.

## Publications

- Youth Policy: Purpose & Description.
- Youth Policy: Annual Report, 1981.
- Colorado State Youth Coordination Strategy. 1982-1983, A 12-month Plan.

## Contact

Gene Kane
Office of Manpower Planning & Development
Department of Labor & Employment
770 Grant, Suite 222
Denver, CO 80203
303-866-3165

C. Connecticut: Jobs for Connecticut Youth (JCY)

This is a comprehensive youth employment and training effort led by the State's Department of Education but which involves a range of other state agencies. It is presently being piloted in six regions of the state. Local "Area Action Teams" (AATs) comprised of community, education, business and industry leadership are responsible for coordination, planning and resource allocation for youth services.

The program is designed to provide new or expanded education, employment and training services for economically and educationally disadvantaged youth by 1987, so that all youth have 1) basic reading and writing competencies, 2) some private sector work experience, 3) post school employment or further education opportunity. Seed funding has been provided by the State and a major national foundation.

Key Elements

- Focus on 14 to 21 year-olds, economically and/or educationally disadvantaged.
- Five year "Education for Employment" strategy. In the first year will serve 1,850 teenagers; ultimately to reach all "at-risk" youth.
- Goals:
  - provision of basic skills necessary for a decent job;
  - work experience providing proper work attitudes and workplace behavior, and self confidence;
  - a specific job or further education and training opportunity;
  - establishment of an efficient service delivery system combining resources of disparate agencies and organizations, public and private.
- Area Action Teams (AAT) composed of business and industry, education and community, responsible for recruitment, training and on-site work experiences.
- Piloted in six regions: Hartford, New Haven, Danielson/Willamantic, Stamford/Norwalk, Waterbury, Bridgeport.

## Distinctive Features

- Funding from state and local government and private foundation. FY 1982 budget: $1.56 million, approximately 54% local public and private resources, 16% loaned state agency staff time, 30% State Department of Education funds.

## Publications

- Jobs for Connecticut Youth: A State Strategy to Reduce Youth Unemployment. Status Report, Fall, 1982.

## Contact

Joseph A. Fitzgerald
Bureau Chief
Youth Employment & Training

Clem Green
Director, JCY
Department of Education
Box 2219
Hartford, CT 06115
203-566-2857

D. Indiana: Governor's Committee on Youth Employment

This 10-person committee, established in 1979, is chaired by one of the state's leading CEOs. Under the Committee's sponsorship, a series of meetings, attended by the Governor, were held state wide to examine the youth unemployment problem and to suggest local approaches to its amelioration. The Committee, funded by two state agencies--the State Board of Vocational and Technical Assistance and State Office of Occupational Development--and local foundations, will expire at the end of January 1983. It is hoped, however, that the local projects will continue with local support.

Key Elements

- Committee originally appointed in 1979 by Governor Bowen. Reappointed through 1982 by Governor Orr.
- In fall 1980, study published, recommending locally developed and managed programs, involving public and private resources.
- Five pilot efforts launched in Muncie and counties of Kosciusko, Lake and Porter, Marion, and Scott.
- All emphasize local development and funding, interagency coordination and resource sharing, private and public partnership.

Distinctive Features

- Gubernatorial leadership key in initiation and promotion.
- Due to expire at end of January 1983 but projects hope to continue with support of local resources

Publications

- Preliminary Report to the Governor, 9/80; Interim Report to the Governor, 9/82; Final Report to the Governor, (forthcoming).
- Special Report on the Youth Employment Problem in Southeastern Indiana, 9/81.
- Trends of Youth Employment in Indiana (1980-85).

## Contact

Jim Byrd
Executive Director
Governor's Committee on Youth Employment
P.O. Box 1636
Indianapolis, IN 46206
317-637-3451

## E. Michigan: State Youth Policy

The state's Youth Employment Clearinghouse has been instrumental in developing a State Youth Policy, the implementation of which is presently being negotiated by the State Departments of Education and Labor. Since 1977, the Clearinghouse has served several important functions, as: a statewide information resource, conference sponsor, technical assistance resource, research agent, coordinator of the state summer youth effort and facilitator of state-level interagency coordination.

Beginning in 1979, with the support of national DOL funds and Governor's discretionary grants, locally-based Interagency Collaborative Boards (ICBs) were established in communities throughout Michigan. At the end of 1982, there were ICBs in 32 of the 33 prime sponsorships. ICBs are forums of local educators, CETA planners and youth agencies, designed to encourage collaboration on school-to-work transition activities. They are useful vehicles for the dissemination of information on the Youth Policy and for local implementation of the Policy's objectives.

### Key Elements

- Focus on 14-21 year olds.
- Four policy goals:
  - improve long-term employability of youth
  - serve youth with special needs
  - promote job creation
  - ensure coordination of resources at both the state and community level.
- Implementation is the primary responsibility of the state Departments of Education and Labor.

### Distinctive Features

- The role of the Youth Employment Clearinghouse as a catalyst, instrumental in developing the Youth Policy and in bringing together key state agencies.
- Statewide network of 32 Interagency Collaborative Boards, vehicles in-place for local cooperation and coordination.

## Publications

- Annual Report.
- Sourcebook of Youth Employment Statistics.
- Policy for Youth Employment and Training in the State of Michigan. 1982

## Contact

Charles Altman
Director
Youth Employment Clearinghouse
Bureau of Employment & Training
Michigan Department of Labor
7150 Harris Drive, Box 30015
Lansing, MI 48909
517-322-1788

F. Oregon: The Youth Employment and Education Plan ($YE^2P$):

This was a joint effort of the State Department of Education and Employment Division. It was launched following extensive study and hearings by a subcommittee of the state legislature. It has been dubbed the "Druthers Plan," the response to a challenge of a State Senate Task Force to develop an "ideal" youth employment system -- one that disregarded restrictive federal and state regulations but remained within reasonable funding levels. "If you had your druthers," state youth planners were charged, "what kind of a system would you develop?" They developed $YE^2P$.

Piloted in seven demonstration sites, $YE^2P$ sought to address the education and employment needs of both in-school and out-of-school youth. In-school participants were offered a range of services through the public school. Out-of-school youth were served through conveniently located planning centers where they received comprehensive assessment, counseling and job referral. Funding of the demonstrations was provided from Governor's CETA discretionary grants and local sources. Almost 1,500 youth were served in 1981.

Key Elements

- Focus on at-risk youth, 14-21 years old.
- Six objectives, requiring changes within the state's education and employment systems. More specifically:

  For in-school youth:

  1. remedial education services beginning at elementary level, to ensure basic academic skills
  2. career education/information
  3. individual career guidance
  4. active involvement of private sector in school career education activities
  5. work experience opportunities

  For out-of-school youth:

  6. comprehensive assessment, counseling and referral through local planning centers

- Developed by state Departments of Education and Employment Division in response to state legislature study.
- Funding, primarily Governor's CETA discretionary funds and local sources, through '81; future after that unclear.
- Unemployment for youths and adults very serious problem in the state.

## Distinctive Features

- Interest and participation of the state legislature.
- Focus on systems reform.
- Evaluation (process and quantitative) conducted by the State Department of Education.

## Publications

- Youth Unemployment: Report of the Senate Interim Task Force. July, 1980
- Youth Education and Employment Program ($YE^2P$). Final Evaluation Report. Oregon Department of Education, June, 1982.

## Contact

Lea Jenny, Administrator
350 Sunset Ave. North
Salem, OR 97303

Les Adkins, Director
Student Services
Department of Education
700 Pringle Parkway SE
Salem, OR 97310
503-378-3864

G. Wisconsin: The Wisconsin Youth Initiative (WYI)

This effort is being spearheaded by the Governor's Employment and Training Office (GETO), an executive agency of the Governor that is responsible also for disbursing and monitoring the Governor's CETA discretionary allocations.

WYI is supported by a mix of state General Public Revenue (GPR) funding ($3 million for 1981-1983), CETA discretionary grants and local prime sponsor allocations. The GPR funding and discretionary monies are allocated to local projects through a carefully developed RFP process, primarily as "seed" money to prompt changes or to fill in service gaps.

WYI is being piloted in five "target" areas where local management forums (LMF) are responsibile for establishing a comprehensive system of youth education, training and employment services. The forums consist of local public and private leaders.

Key Elements

- Serves youth between the ages of 16 and 21 who are economically and educationally disadvantaged, particularly dropouts and potential dropouts.
- Aims to establish a comprehensive system of youth education, training and employment services. Focused on five "target" areas in and surrounding: Milwaukee, Racine (SE corner of the state), Green Bay/Oconto (NE area of state) Ashland/Superior (NW Wisconsin) and La Crosse in the West. Multi-year, multi-phased. Ultimately statewide.
- Emphasis on coordination at state and local level of various youth service agencies.
- Local Managment Forums (LMF) consisting of local public and private leaders responsible for project planning and implementation.

Distinctive Features

- Broad funding mix: state General Public Revenues ($3 million for 1981-83), Governor's CETA discretionary grants, and local education and vocational education resources.
- GETO staff assist with local development.

## Publications

- Wisconsin Youth Initiative (WYI) Resource Document.
- Wisconsin Youth Initiative: Update, Sprirg, 1982.
- Report on Statewide Local Management Forum (LMF) Meeting. Sponsored by a grant from the Aetna Foundation. May 20, 1982.

## Contact

Federigo Zaragoza
Executive Director
GETO
30 W. Mifflin
Madison, WI 53702
608-266-5370

# II. HIGHLIGHTS

## A. Origins

All of these efforts were initiated in the period 1977 -1981, prompted by one or more of the following factors: the enactment of the federal $1.5 billion Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act -- representing a revived federal commitment to youth employment -- a commitment that had languished since the early 70s; the growing national concern and awareness of the problem as youth unemployment levels reached record highs and literacy levels of high school graduates new depths; and finally, a substantial growth in state responsibility and powers.

Although they all have varying degrees of gubernatorial support, the major "driving" force behind each of these initiatives varies widely. In the states of Indiana and Colorado, for example, the governor's office appears to have been significantly involved in generating support and public awareness of the problem. In Indiana, following his establishment of a Governor's Committee on Youth Employment, Governor Bowen personally chaired a series of well-publicized statewide meetings during 1980 to discuss youth employment with local business, educational and civic leadership. His successor, Governor Orr, expressed his personal concern immediately upon assuming office and asked the Committee to continue its efforts. In Colorado, Governor Lamm, like his Indiana peers, has played a strong role in his state's youth employment projects. Through his leadership, five state agencies: the Department of Labor and Employment, Department of Education, the Division of Occupational Education, Department of Institutions, and Department of Social Services cooperated in developing the Youth Coordination Strategy.

In Oregon and California, state legislatures took the lead. They sponsored studies and hearings resulting in the enactment of the Youth Employment and Development Act (YEDA) in California and the Youth Employment and Education Plan ($YE^2P$) in Oregon. The California legislature appropriated close to $23 million for the period FY 1979 - FY 1982.

In the examples of Connecticut, Michigan and Wisconsin, the key catalyst has been a single state agency or department: the Department of Education in Connecticut, Youth Employment Clearinghouse in Michigan, and an Executive agency of the Governor, the Governor's Employment and Training Office (GETO) in Wisconsin.

B. Goals

Each of the efforts addresses youth unemployment comprehensively through enhanced state and local agency collaboration and resource-sharing, and private sector participation. They aim to equip youth with: basic employability skills, including the "three R's" and responsible work attitudes and behavior; and to provide career exposure to enable youth to become productive participants in the work force.

C. Implementation

An incremental development strategy with emphasis on local control has been adopted by five of the six states with program activity: Colorado, Connecticut, Indiana, Oregon and Wisconsin. Basically, this strategy is a multi-phase, multi-year process in which a selected number of local projects "pilot" new programs or delivery mechanisms, creating a foundation for subsequent expansion and refinement.

In California, the emphasis has been somewhat different. YEDA has funded a variety of discrete programs with the objective of testing a range of approaches to increase youth employability in the private sector.

Local management forums (LMFS) in Wisconsin and Area Action Teams (AATS) in Connecticut are chiefly responsible for determining project scale, ensuring the availability of a full range of services, engaging private sector support and designating local agency roles. The pilots in the states of Indiana and Oregon are also under the oversight of local leadership groups with a variety of designations.

D. Target Youth

The youth population served by each of these initiatives includes those between the ages of 14 and 25 years who have a high-risk of sustained periods of unemployment as adults.

Specifically:

- California's YEDA targets unemployed, 16-21 year-olds, with emphasis on those who: 1) have difficulty finding employment, 2) reside in the inner-city, 3) have an annual family income which is less than 95% of the lower living standard. (Beginning in January 1983, the focus of YEDA will be on youth who are economically disadvantaged, particularly those receiving public assistance).

- Colorado's Youth Strategy aims to reach all youths who have employment needs. But it is presently targeted on disadvantaged, "multi-problem," "high-risk," youth, i.e., those with low skills and little knowledge of or access to the labor market, those who are dropouts, and those with criminal records.

- Connecticut broadly defines the target population as "at-risk youth," aged 14-21, who are economically and/or educationally disadvantaged.

- The Governor's Commission in Indiana has identified 16-25 year-olds with high-risk of chronic unemployment as the focus of the state's employment activities.

- Michigan's Youth policy addresses the needs of 14-21 year-olds.

- Oregon serves 14-21 year-olds who are "at-risk," including dropouts or potential dropouts.

- Wisconsin's target youth population is between the ages of 16 and 21, economically and educationally disadvantaged, dropouts or potential dropouts.

E. Funding

"Maximization of existing resources" is a theme that runs throughout each of these initiatives. The common assumption is that more effective and more cost-efficient programs can be developed, and that closer cooperation between agencies and partnership with the private sector can increase, thereby expanding substantially the availability and quality of services to youth without requiring a lot of "new money." The existing funding sources upon which the initiatives draw include: CETA Governor's Discretionary funds and prime sponsor allocations, primarily Titles II and IV; vocational education; and education.

Additional state funding has been appropriated by the California and Wisconsin legislatures: $22.6 million by the California legislature for the period FY 1979-82 and $3 million by Wisconsin lawmakers for the biennium 1981-83. The California funding has been used primarily to support programs that test a variety of youth training and employment strategies, with emphasis on private sector approaches. Wisconsin's state monies are being used to support services not adequately available in the target areas -- for the most part assessment and basic skills remediation -- and to "lever" systems reform by providing financial incentives for local agency cooperation and development of

more effective operating mechanisms. An additional $840,736 in Governor's CETA discretionary grants was used in FY 82 to support 25 projects in the target areas, primarily efforts that fostered local interagency coordination.

In Indiana, the State Board of Vocational and Technical Education and the State Office of Occupational Development together provided $360,000 between 1980 and 1982 to the Governor's Committee for Technical Assistance Services and Conferences. Another $77,000 was donated to the Committee by Indiana corporations and foundations for staff support activities. The individual project activities draw on local public and private sources. In the case of Oregon, the Governor's Education (Linkage) discretionary money was the "carrot" that stimulated structured local interagency working arrangements in the seven target sites. In order to qualify for the $856,000 in discretionary funds, these localities were required to meet stipulated criteria for local cooperation.

The Colorado Youth Coordination Strategy has a mix of funding from the five state departments involved in the strategy's development and promotion. The agencies of: Education, Institutions, Labor and Employment, Social Services and Division of Occupational Education have contributed $160,000 in 1983 towards the strategy's implementation.

In Connecticut state and local funds have been allocated for the first year of operation in the amount of $1.56 million, with a comparable amount to be committed in the second year. The total includes about $840,000 in local resources; $250,000 worth of personnel time from the state agencies for Employment and Training; and $476,000 from the State Department of Education, despite a reduction of more than $2 million in federal funds available to the department for vocational education in 1982-83. The Edna McConnell Clark Foundation provided a $60,000 planning grant in 1982 and has committed an additional $255,000 to support local program operations in 1983.

F. Private Sector Involvement

Private sector involvement is a key element in four of the initiatives where it has assumed a variety of forms including membership on an advisory council or board, financial or in-kind contribution, and in a few instances, involvement in program operations.

In Indiana the Governor's 10-member Youth Committee, chaired by one of the state's leading corporate executives, Matthew Dalton, includes seven private sector representives (five businessmen and two state-level labor union officers). Mr. Dalton has served on the committee since its inception and co-chaired a series of state-wide hearings with the Governor.

The leadership of Indiana's five local pilot projects also includes substantial private sector representation.

California has funded several demonstration programs that offer financial incentives to private sector firms that provide work experience or training opportunities to youth. In the period FY 1977 to FY 1982, almost 80% of the projects sponsored under YEDA have involved the private sector.

In Connecticut, private sector CEOs serve on Area Action Teams to provide general oversight and assist in the development of program strategies.

The Colorado Alliance of Business (CAB) has played an active role in engaging private sector participation in the implementation of the State's Youth Strategy through a statewide network of local business leaders. Beginning in fall 1981, CAB launched a statewide Youth Employment project (funded by a local foundation and the state) comprised of:

- Summer Job Hunt, in which employment specialists, placed in offices throughout the state, provide youth "job-readiness" training.

- World of Work Orientation, whereby business representatives conduct classes on job finding techniques.

- Delivery systems seminars, which are forums for information exchange between public sector youth service staff and private sector personnel management.

In the states of Oregon, Michigan and Wisconsin private sector participation has been negligible. Efforts to increase involvement are underway in the latter two examples.

G. Results

The availability of descriptive and/or statistical information for each project varies considerably, reflecting differences in life-span, reporting requirements of funding sources, and project staff resources. According to available information (however uneven), the following results have been accomplished.

Once every two years since 1979, the California Employment Development Department has submitted a report to the legislature concerning YEDA activities. Cumulative data is available on expenditures, youth-service levels, termination results, costs per program, etc. Comparisons with the results of the State's CETA-funded youth programs have also been examined. According to the January 1982 report to the State legislature, covering four

years of program operations, YEDA expenditures totalled $14.02 million, serving almost 11,000 youth at cost of $2,910 per participant. (This compares to $3,860 per youth under the state's CETA-funded youth program, YFTP). Close to 75% of the youth participants had positive terminations, with 4,800 (44%) entering employment, and the remaining 3,356 (31%) continuing their education.

The 1981 Annual Report on the Colorado Youth Coordination Strategy describes a number of accomplishments, including:

- Establishment of a "pilot county" project to demonstrate a comprehensive assessment and delivery system for high-risk youth, which served approximately 50 youths in 1981.

- An increase in the availability and quality of career and labor market information through the combined efforts of the Colorado Department of Education, the Career Information System, the CCEA, the SBCCOE, the Colorado Alliance of Business, and others.

The Strategy's 1982-83 12-month plan identifies a variety of projects -- statewide, target, and experimental -- to guide the next year's effort. The signatory agencies have committed $160,000 to fund Strategy activities.

Since 1981, the Indiana Governor's Committee has prepared a series of reports on the state's youth unemployment problem and has helped with the organization of five local projects -- two of which are operational, with the remaining three still largely in the planning stages. The operating projects Youth Opportunity Unlimited (YOU) in Muncie and the Youth Employment Council (YEC) in Kosciusko County -- are designed to improve the employability skills of juniors and seniors. YOU offers assessment, pre-employment skills and work experience. In 1981, 73 youth were served, 52 of whom found full-time employment after graduation. (A recent follow-up survey has found that 71% of these are still employed). In 1982, YOU helped 75 students. (The placement figures are not yet available.)

YEC has served close to 1150 students in five Kosciusko County high schools through private-sector sponsored Employability Skills seminars. Representatives from a variety of local employers conduct one-hour sessions, over a 3-4 day period, to inform students about career opportunities.

Staff of Michigan's Departments of Education and Employment, and the Youth Clearinghouse have been meeting regularly since the summer to foster widespread public awareness and support of the Governor's Youth policy. Information about the policy is being

disseminated through a statewide network of 32 interagency collaborative boards (ICBs) which are local forums of school, education, and employment and training leadership.

The local networking and information sharing which began under Oregon's YE$^2$P continues in most of the project sites. However, until the state's economy improves, the youth employment issue will continue to be a "back-burner" concern for state lawmakers. Oregon's Department of Education sponsored two studies of the YE$^2$P -- one focusing on the background and description of the program, the other examining some of the quantitative outcomes of YE$^2$P. numbers and characteristics of youth served, program costs and impacts. Between January 1981 and February 1982, there were 1,541 YE$^2$P participants: 60% male, nearly 70% 16-19 years old, 26% 14-15 years old; 60% were in-school, and 40% were high school dropouts. Almost two thirds of YE$^2$P participants for whom records are available experienced a positive change; they either found employment or returned to school as a result of participation in the program. Overall, the average cost per client was $387. Most of the services provided through YE$^2$P were assessment and employability development. The final YE$^2$P evaluation concludes with some observations on factors appearing to relate to program success. Among them, are:

- close coordination with public schools
- comprehensive client assessment
- clearly defined (preferrably written) interagency working arrangements
- aggressive, forceful project leadership, particularly important in effecting (and negotiating) meaningful, interagency coordination

According to the latest available report, a July 1982 update, the Wisconsin Youth Initiative has in the past year succeeded in providing close to 1,350 youth in the five target sites with a variety of assessment, basic skills, and ABE/GED services, with $1.2 million in state funds. (This underestimates significantly the full scope of WYI activities, as these statistics relate only to the state funded projects). With Governor's Special Grant CETA funds, close to $840,000 was allocated to 25 projects in the pilot areas. Participant outcome data on this effort is not yet available.

Some of the most significant WYI results are not-quantifiable, but include such accomplishments as: increased interagency communications, improved public awareness of the state's youth education and employment problems and the institutionalization of joint local agency planning.

With the establishment of Local Management Forums (LMFs) in each of the five pilot areas, local youth service delivery in Wisconsin is in the process of significant overhaul -- to increase efficiency, eliminate duplication and identify gaps in resources. Broadly, each LMF is responsible for the planning and coordination of resources and services for "at-risk" youth; assessing the efficiency of the system; serving as a vehicle for fostering voluntary reallocation of resources by encouraging collaborative planning and service management. A forum, funded with a grant from the Aetna Foundation, was held in April 1982 to discuss the roles and activities of the LMFs. Close to 60 persons attended, including LMF members, GETO and other state agency staff, and two state legislators.

## III. CONCLUSIONS

In the process of gathering information for this paper, state youth officials were asked to identify obstacles that had interfered with development or implementation of their statewide youth projects, as a guide to other states for avoiding similar problem areas.

Analysis of these responses, supplemented by extensive conversations with state planners, other experts, and P/PV's own field experience, suggest that the following components are critical to an effective, comprehensive state youth employment and training effort.

1. Consistent and visible gubernatorial support.

2. Formal commitment by a broad range of state youth-related agencies or departments, including the departments of employment, education, higher education, and Governor's Office. (This cooperation is best effected through requisite #1.)

3. A comprehensive, clearly developed state plan that identifies broad goals and objectives but leaves to local leadership the responsibility for local planning and implementation.

4. Creative local use of both public and private funding resources.

5. Availability of state incentives (or "rewards") carefully designed to spur local initiatives.

6. Establishment of small-scale "pilot" efforts to develop a foundation upon which subsequent activities can build.

7. Consistent, active private sector support and involvement at both the state and local level.

Over the next year, state youth planners will be busy adjusting their systems and programmatic focus to the objectives and requirements of the new federal employment and training legislation, the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA). This legislation, with its emphasis on an increased state role, will undoubtedly prompt many new efforts as well as the expansion of current programs.*

Some of the JTPA particulars that will significantly affect the state role in youth employment and training policy include:

- direct gubernatorial responsibility for the review of local employment and training plans and for the designation of local service delivery areas; governors will have a 6% discretionary set-aside for use as an incentive to reward well-performing local areas;

- emphasis on increased state agency coordination between education and job training, providing for this purpose an 8% setaside that must be matched by other funding sources;

- requirement that at least 40% of local JTPA funds be used for youth services.

We look forward to the new policies and activities of the states, anticipating that many of the same elements and procedures outlined in the models described herein will be incorporated into new state plans.

*A fuller discussion of the implications of JTPA for state youth policy, is found in Mott Working Paper #3, The Potential State Role in Youth Employment, by Richard H. de Lone, December 1982.